

CHRISTIANITY and *CRISIS*

A BI-WEEKLY JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN OPINION

Volume 1, No. 22

December 15, 1941

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Church and State in America

THERE have been several episodes in recent weeks which have raised the question of the independence of the Church from state control and give a welcome occasion to re-examine the character and the value of the historic American conception of the separation of Church and State.

The first of these episodes was a letter by Mayor LaGuardia to the clergymen of the nation, asking them to observe Civilian Defense Week. His letter enclosed the outline of a sermon on the relation of religion to democracy which, he declared, "exemplifies the kind of message we are thinking of and which might be used effectively." Though no one denies that the sermon outline was a good one, it was undoubtedly a foolish blunder to send it and it is unfortunate that the Office of Civilian Defense did not consult with responsible Church leaders, who could have informed it of the inevitable reaction of parsons to "canned" sermons put out under government auspices.

The mistake which LaGuardia made was, of course, not as great as the absurd hysteria with which his mistake was greeted by the spokesmen of Christian isolationism. To declare that "Hitler and Goebbels never went further" in their control of the religious life of Germany than LaGuardia went in his predigested sermon is a charge so ludicrous as to require no refutation. Nevertheless, we hope we shall have no more such sermons.

Another episode which has aroused churchmen is the alleged action of a commander of an army camp near Denver in declaring certain churches in Denver "out of bounds" for his soldiers because isolationist meetings were held in these churches. The commander denies that religious services were affected by his order, but the incident has aroused apprehensions in the minds of church people.

The third and more serious episode centers about a young man, the son of a Methodist minister, who has been sentenced to two years imprisonment for draft evasion, after his local draft board and appeal board had rejected his plea that he is a conscientious objector. The Methodist Conference of Southern

California and Arizona felt that this case represented a serious miscarriage of justice and the young man has the support of many Methodist clergymen who are not pacifists. Nevertheless, the local U. S. District Attorney threatened the entire conference with an FBI investigation.

This particular incident calls attention to a serious defect in our conscription act in that its provisions for taking appeals from the decisions of local draft boards are too administrative and not sufficiently judicial. The appeal is made to the President through the administrator of the conscription act. In Great Britain civilian tribunals have been set up to hear such appeals and they are manned by well-known leaders in the cultural life of the nation. They are able to separate the wheat from the chaff and their decisions, arrived at after sober public probing, carry a moral authority which no purely administrative decision made by overworked administrators of a draft act can have.

It would be well if non-pacifist Christian leaders could support pacifists in securing a better appeal system. For it is important that the part of the Church which is not pacifist should nevertheless impress upon the general community that it understands the religious source of conscientious scruples against arms-bearing and that it appreciates this religious perfectionism, as the general community cannot, as a valid part of the Christian tradition.

It might be well to emphasize that the American tradition of the separation of Church and State represents a delicate balance and cannot be maintained merely by the fiat of law. An absolute separation would require, as Roger Williams believed it did, that religion be regarded as purely a private matter. This would mean that the Church would not speak on public and social issues in return for the State's abstention from any control over the purely private religious convictions of its citizens. We have never had that kind of separation of Church and State in this country and we certainly do not desire it. Any conception of Christianity which gives social content to its message makes a certain overlapping between

church and state authority inevitable. The Church does speak upon social and political issues. But if the State is to appreciate the function of religion and understand, in a measure, the profound religious sources of moral convictions, it is also necessary that religious teachers have a proper sense of responsibility toward the true function of political society.

It has been common among certain critics of our government in recent years to cry to high heaven at any real or imagined infringement of their liberty, but to betray by their very criticisms that they are informed by essentially anarchistic conceptions of society. They have spoken of both legislative and executive acts of government as "Fascist" and as "tyrannical" when these epithets could have meaning only upon the assumption that the coercive acts of government are of themselves evil, which is to say that government is evil. For governments do coerce. The idea that we could move by progressive steps to a society of purely voluntary cooperation is an anarchistic and utopian illusion.

A religious criticism of policies of governments is important and necessary. For there is finally no vantage point, other than the religious one, from which to judge the self-deification of nations. But such criticisms can be effective only if the critic recognizes government as a divine ordinance and has a decent sense of reverence toward the majesty of the law which coordinates the vitalities of a nation.

Some of the hysterical criticisms made of our government in recent years have been either completely irresponsible, or they have been informed by implicit or explicit social philosophies which the historical experience of man has invalidated. These critics might do well to read Romans 13. They will not find the whole of the Christian attitude toward the State expressed in these Pauline words. But they will find a half of the Christian truth there, which they have neglected.

An Ineffectual Sermon on Love

The occasion was an isolationist meeting under religious auspices. The speaker presented his cause as identical with that of the gospel of Christ. He declared that the "gospel" commanded us to love one another and that those who participated in warfare violated this commandment. The critical hearer remembered that "the law was given by Moses but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" and wondered whether much of the hardness of heart, the Pharisaic self-righteousness, and the bitterness toward those who hold other beliefs, so frequently manifest in circles of political pacifism, is not derived from this

confusion of "gospel" and "law." Can love actually be a law? It is indeed the fulfillment of all law. But if the gospel is presented as merely a new law, namely the law of love, and as a law moreover which anyone can keep if only he puts his mind to it, the preacher of such a doctrine naturally assumes that he is loyal to this law. Is he not preaching it with vigor? Only he does not know himself as well as St. Paul knew himself, and has not yet discovered that there is a law in his members which wars against the law that is in his mind.

The speaker went on to assert that all the clergymen who favored resisting Nazism ought to be in uniform if they followed the logic of their position consistently. The critical hearer thought that the speaker ought to be upon the Cross if he followed the logic of his position consistently. Was he not insisting that only the Cross, that only "sacrificial love" would save the world? The speaker thought that if our love were pure enough it would overcome Hitler's tyranny? The critical hearer wondered whether that meant that Christ's love was not pure enough since it did not soften Pilate's heart nor save Judas from his treason and apostasy. How blindly these apostles of love seek to make a success story out of the Cross. And what foolishness they make of the Cross. Only their foolishness is not the foolishness of God which is wiser than the wisdom of men. It is just foolishness. They think they can rob human life and history of its tragic note by just a little more moral admonition.

The speaker continued to cast aspersions upon the motives of those who had become "war-mongers." The critical hearer remembered that "love thinketh no evil." The speaker declared that only those who shared his position belonged to the "true church" and predicted that the remainder of the church would be submerged under the vengeance of a disillusioned world after the war. The critical hearer remembered that "love vaunteth not itself." The speaker declared that the courage of those who resisted government was greater than the courage of those who "submitted to Cæsar." The critical hearer thought it dangerous to make such comparisons. There is undoubtedly splendid courage in the lives of many non-resisters. But we have it on good authority that it is possible "to give your body to be burned" and not have love.

The critical hearer left the meeting regretting that he had not heard an exposition of the love commandment which might really have stirred his conscience. If the preacher had been a perfectionist who had the grace of true innocence, even if that innocence were devoid of any understanding of the complexities of political justice, he might have been

an instrument of grace even to one who is quite certain that justice must be established at the price of war if necessary.

Those of us who are relativists in politics must admit that however definitely we may be committed to the task of resisting tyranny even at the price of war, it is salutary to be reminded of the hazards of our enterprise and the terrible character of the price we must pay for the ends we seek. We cannot do what we

do without an uneasy conscience. And it is good for us to have our conscience sensitized by a vision of the ideal of perfect love.

But the apostle of love ought to give some evidence of having inwardly digested the true meaning of the parable of the Pharisee and publican. If this is not the case, we shall merely regret his political ignorance and remain calm under the castigations of his Pharisaic fury.

What Is Federal Union?

FRANKLIN D. LOEHR

IT IS difficult to explain briefly a movement as sweeping, an idea as big, a proposal as carefully constructed, as Federal Union. What follows must of necessity be in many points skeletonized, simply because space is lacking for detailed development.

Federal Union Is a Belief in History

History is, in one sense, the pushing back of horizons, the record of the slow enlargement of the social unit in which man lives, thinks, and earns his living. The family was quickly outgrown as the largest unit of which man felt himself a member, because security from the saber-tooth tiger could be gotten only by your primordial grandfather teaming up with mine, because the hunt was more successful if a group beat the brush, because the man with a good catch would trade some of his fish with the successful finder of a bed of edible roots and each have fish and potatoes, and because the innate gregariousness of human nature sought the comfort and stimulation of fellowship. So out of the family came the patriarchal social unit, wherein a man's sons and their households clustered around the paternal tent, and in time each one felt a tie of cooperation and loyalty to every one within the bloodstream of his clan.

The transition from clan to tribe grew out of one of the truly epoch-making discoveries of all human history—the discovery that I could be loyal to someone outside of my own bloodstream, could accept a “stranger” into my social unit. The logical next step was the union of tribes (or states, their contemporary counterpart) into nations—such as the “Six Nations (really tribes) of the Iroquois” Indians, the 22 cantons of Switzerland, the 48 United States of America. Be it Germany (under Bismarck, 1870), Italy (Cavour, Garibaldi, Mazzini, ca. 1860) or the United States of America (with perhaps the oldest continuous form of national government, since 1789), every major nation in the world today came to birth

by the uniting of states, free cities, duchies, principalities, etc., into this larger national unit. Federal Union believes—and who doesn't?—that this inexorable historic progression will some day reach its logical, inevitable culmination in a union of nations into the longsought United States of Man.

Federal Union Is a Belief in the World Community

Be it home, church, club, city, state, nation, or world, there are three requisites of Community. When these three are operative on a world scale, and not before, we shall see established the World Community, the end-product of the historic process of the enlargement of the social unit.

The first requisite of Community is a felt mutual concern, a recognized area of common interest. This is the first thing making for any social grouping—a sense of some interests in common. How close are we to meeting it for World Community? Well,—when (1) science, epitomized by the airplane which scorns so raucously the imaginary lines we draw upon the surface of the earth and over which we post such ridiculously solemn signs: “This is a national boundary. Thou shalt not pass”; when science speaks the same language the world around and cannot be confined by national border-lines; when (2) business, which is not a capitalist in Wall Street arranging million-dollar deals, but rather you and I earning bread and butter for ourselves and our loved ones—when the matter of you and me earning a living is so internationalized that we'll get no more than 60¢ a bushel for our corn if a buyer can get it in Argentina for 50¢ and haul it here for another dime; when (3) culture is so internationalized that we travel round the world simply on pleasure cruises, and find foreign students in almost every one of even our small colleges, and, instead of confining ideas, sow them broadcast throughout the world with the speed of light (“Power

lies in the ideas to which the future belongs," said Dr. Fosdick some ten years ago—and if we need any proof, just look at Adolf Hitler, who commandeered the total resources of a great nation of 80,000,000 people by selling them an *idea*, the idea that they had been wronged, had a revenge coming, and were really the "Herrenvolk," the master-race, destined to dominate the world); when (4) nineteen centuries of Christian preaching of the universal Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of man, backed up by another 19 centuries of the Jewish teaching of brotherhood, has spurred the general ethical development of human thought to the acceptance of justice as valid in its own right—justice not only for ourselves and our friends, but also for those whom we know not, and even for our enemies, simply because it is justice, and should be done; when (5) this war has, for a second time within a quarter century put the emotional motivation (so needed by our indolent human nature) back of an intellectual realization that no longer can any nation live or die unto itself alone—when we find five such all-important factors of our daily living as science, business, culture, religion-ethics, and this war, all operating on a super-national plane, then Federal Union believes that the first requisite of World Community has been well filled, and that we do recognize a large area of vital interests which humanity today shares in common, irrespective of and above all national distinctions.

The second requisite of Community is a sense of loyalty, a willingness to good citizenship, on the part of the individuals who make up that community. We must be good members of our homes, our hometowns, our nations. Even a church, over whose doors are written large the words "Whosoever wilt," wants for members only those who will be willing and loyal; my church fellowship prides itself on an absence of creedal requirements, but we ask all newcomers to covenant with us in two purposes—to believe and follow the God of Christ Jesus our Lord, and to be a good member of our Church. We shall not have World Community until you and I, the common people the world over, are ready to undertake the responsibilities of world citizenship. . . . And in the great, heartbroken sigh that greeted this war—not the huzzas and singing of August, 1914, not the parades of April, 1917, but the great sigh of September, 1939, broken only by the sound of a sobbing that would not be comforted—in the disillusioned, broken, heartsick way in which the common people the world around greeted this war, do we not see the readiness of the *people* to shake hands across national borders, to call the Samaritan their neighbor, to refuse no longer to call themselves citizens of the world?

Federal Union believes that it need not take another war to make real to us the World Community

in which we live and think and earn our living, that we have recognized this larger area of our common concerns and are willing to begin thinking and acting in terms of world citizenship.

Federal Union Is a Belief in Government

But there is a third requisite of community,—Government. And every community must have it. You know what happens in a home when the parents lose all authority, all discipline. The communities of city, state, and nation could not long survive without some establishment for maintaining law and order. Churches have government. Even in a community of angels, as Kirby Page has said, there must at least be traffic rules and traffic "cops" to see that those rules are known and obeyed—else some very nice elderly female angel might prefer to drive along the left side of a busy highway, because she admired the scenery on that side; a fiery young angel crusading for freedom and equality might conscientiously object to stopping at through streets ("Why should they have the right of way over me?"); and a pair of young angels might park on the bridge at midnight, turning off all lights, to watch the moon come up over the river. In all communities, even a community of angels, there must be Government.

It is the lack of this third requisite that holds up the establishment of an orderly World Community today. It is in supplying this lack that this century faces its crucial, decisive challenge. It is in putting Government into the World Community that this generation will find its sacred destiny or a most painful, degrading, and accursed failure. Federal Union believes in Government.

Federal Union, moreover, believes in popular government—of, by and for the people. "We hold these truths to be self-evident . . . that the powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed." We, the people, are the ultimate and absolute possessors of all the powers of Government. We hold them not as a grant from any human law-maker, but as an "unalienable endowment" by God Himself. From that reservoir we give to each area of our inter-relationships precisely those powers of Government that it needs. Within our church we commission our trustees to do certain things, our deacons to perform other functions, and to our pastor, Board of Religious Education, etc., we allot still other duties. In the body politic we empower our city fathers with government over city functions, our township representatives with certain other authority, our county commissioners with warrant to act in that sphere, our state administration with competence to administer and adjudicate within the area of state affairs. Then, a hundred and fifty years ago, our forefathers discovered a new area in which

the thirteen states found ourselves unitedly faced with certain joint problems, and accordingly established, from their reservoir of governmental powers, a new government equipped to operate within the new community of the nation. Now that we have discovered still another area of joint interests, an area in which the lack of Government is directly and drastically harmful to our security and welfare, it is up to us to do precisely what we have had to do in every other area that concerned us—establish a Government; a world government representing us, responsible directly to us, empowered by us to act within that international area, and adequately commissioned to cope with the issues arising in this new World Community.

Federal Union believes in Government. We, the people, are the ultimate and absolute possessors of all the powers of Government. We can delegate certain of those powers as we see fit to establish such governments as we may need, to maintain law and order in every community in which interests of ours are at stake. Essentially, it is as simple as all that.

Federal Union Has a Practical Proposal

We're all "from Missouri" in regard to Government within the World Community: "we've got to be shown" a practical, sensible, realistic pattern before we're willing to attempt it.

Federal Union has that pattern, is that pattern. It is not a dream, nor an untried experiment. It has worked. It has 150 years of successful experience back of it. It has proved itself the best of any pattern we now know upon which a large and divergent group of people can live together in peace and harmony. It is the American way of a federal union of semi-sovereign states.

In 1783 the thirteen American colonies, having gained by a degree of united action their freedom, proceeded to organize themselves as a new and independent country. They did it on the only pattern then known—that of absolute sovereignty for each. Under the "Articles of Confederation" they formed a "League of Friendship," pledging a general good will, but acknowledging each one no law higher than its own self-interests, no authority higher than its own self-will. And speedily, very speedily, they came to grief.

Within four years the six basic defects of such a system had become woefully apparent: (1) Each had its own money, oftentimes accepted at par not even by its own people, and accepted only at great discount or not at all in other states. Try doing business, let alone preserving good will, under such a system! (2) Each had its own defense force—their little "national armies," and the seaboard states their navies. So if North Carolina heard a rumor that

South Carolina had added 50 men to its army, then North Carolina, although not certain if the rumor be true or not, must add 50 or perhaps 75 men to its army, just to be safe—and you had the whole sorry tale of the suspicion and taxation of a competitive armaments race. (3) Each had its own foreign policy. Mercantile New England, with a certain small amount of commerce going down the Mississippi, was making a deal with Spain, who then controlled the mouth of that great river, a deal so inimical to the interests of the settlers in the region of Kentucky that they threatened to put themselves under the protection of England, unless the deal be called off. And still others of these thirteen little nation-states, mindful of Lafayette, were for lining up with France. Foreign intrigue was quick to exploit these divisions, until the world openly looked for the breakup of this country at almost the next moment. (4) Each little nation-state had its own import and export tariffs and quotas. New York put an embargo against Connecticut firewood. Connecticut, with her economic interests damaged and her sacred honor offended, responded with an embargo against all New York products—and trade between these sister-states was at a standstill. (5) Seven of these first thirteen had colonial claims to the continental hinterland, claims stretching in broad bands across to the Mississippi River, and even to the Pacific Ocean. These claims often overlapped (three states laying claim to the same spot in Illinois at the same time), and frontier incidents were arising, and blood was being shed to protect the "colonial empire" from infringement and counter-claimants. (6) And finally, they had each one only his own little state citizenship. They did not think of themselves as Americans—they lived only as Georgians, or Massachusettians, or Delawarians. It even went so far that Pennsylvania called out its national army to evict (and massacre) a settlement of those "damned foreigners" from Connecticut. . . . It is no wonder that in 1786, after but three years of the "League of Friendship," John Jay wrote a letter to George Washington expressing "far greater anxiety for my country now than I ever felt during even the darkest days of the war."

In 1787, the crisis growing desperate, a convention was called to revise the Articles of Confederation. Luckily, it was the golden age of American statesmanship—Jefferson, Madison, Benjamin Franklin, Adams, Monroe, Mason, George Washington and other great names of which we are proud (most of them surprisingly young, too). A month of careful consideration convinced them that it couldn't be made to work, no matter how they might patch it up—that America could never be a strong, secure, prosperous, peaceful country on the basis of thirteen absolutely independent little nation-states. So they discarded

the Articles of Confederation, and wrote that document which is America's greatest contribution to political history—the Constitution. Under it, each member state retained sovereignty in the administration of its own internal affairs, but the *people* of each state—not the state governments, but the *people*—cooperated to establish a new government within this federal area, giving to it powers necessary to deal with the issues that had arisen within that area of inter-state relations—certain specific powers, and no more. Within three years of its adoption, peace had come, and a strength-in-Union sufficient to gain the respect of the world and dignity and security for Americans, and “the greatest peace-time boom in history” was developing prosperity within an unfettered trade area of continental proportions.

Federal Union Proposes—

It is now proposed that we do precisely the same thing on the next level—that we, the people, bring Government to the World Community, upon the experienced, flexible American (or Swiss or Canadian or South African) pattern of a Federal Union.

That pattern is (1) national sovereignty undisturbed in the administration of its internal government; (2) national sovereignty limited, and the basic primal sovereignty of the people exerted, in the establishment of a new federal government within the new area—a government elected by and responsible directly to not the governments (as in a League) but the people of its member nations.

To this world government would be given, by a Constitution drawn up by representatives of the people and ratified directly by the people (binding upon no people until voluntarily accepted by them), those specific powers needed to cope with the issues peculiar to the world community. What those powers should be, only the World Constitutional Convention can say, but from our American experience we might suggest these six:

(1) A Union currency. International monetary exchange is one of the most complicated of economic problems restricting trade and goodwill among nations. A Rumanian shoe manufacturer's sale to a Bulgarian distributing firm may show a nice net profit—say, 10%. But he is to get his money, in 30, 60, or 90 days—and God Himself could scarcely say what Bulgarian money will be worth then. The 10% profit can easily become 20% loss, as things stand today. . . . Trade will be stimulated, and causes of friction greatly reduced, when there is a stable Union Currency in which the whole world can do its business.

(2) A Union Defense Force. Peace is kept not by a nice “balance of power,” but by the unbalance of power—one side holding such a preponderance

that the other dare not make war, and is quickly subdued if it make the suicidal attempt. Peace will be kept tomorrow by the pooled strength of all peoples within the Union, coming fully and automatically to the defense of any and every member of that Union whenever and wherever threatened by aggression. With the Union internally free of the fear, friction, ruinous taxation, and insecurity of competitive armaments, each partakes of the united strength of all.

(3) A Union Foreign Policy. This international Federal Union is designed and destined to include all peoples as quickly as practicable. When that time comes there will be no “foreign policy,” but only domestic policy (and the World Defense Force, greatly reduced, can become the World Police). But we must begin somewhere, with those people who can and will unite at the start to form the nuclear union. And this initial “Federation of the Free” will act as a unit in its “foreign relations” with all other peoples, until they too are included in the great “United States of Man.”

(4) A Union trade area. Prosperity comes, and poverty is overcome, not alone by the production but equally essentially by the interchange of goods and services. We now have discovered, through ample experimentation, the frustration of economic nationalism's high tariffs, subsidies, and other artificial restraints upon trade. The Union would be commissioned to reduce these trade barriers as expeditiously as possible, looking forward to a completely unfettered trade area coterminous with the outermost bounds of the Union itself.

(5) A Union colonial administration. Each country entering the Union (even as each state entering the American union) turns over all its colonies to the Union. The Union (a) opens these colonies on equal terms to all members of the Union, (b) protects the colonies from undue exploitation, and (c) develops the colonial peoples into that state of political maturity from which they are admitted as free and equal independent members of the Union.

(6) A Union citizenship. No person entering the United States of Man need lose any citizenship he now possessed. He but gains a new citizenship, with new rights, new dignity, new protection, and a great new enlargement of the world in which he lives, thinks, and earns his living.

To be an Illinoisan is not enough; even to be an American is not our greatest possible destiny; there is a horizon out beyond, a larger world to claim and make our own, and we can rest content only as full citizens of all God's world. This is what Federal Union proposes.

In Conclusion

Federal Union is essentially an idea—the idea that

God has a purpose for this world of His, a purpose revealed in history, a purpose of brotherhood and peace undergirded and maintained in the only way brotherhood and peace can ever be ours—through a *Community* of the peoples involved.

Federal Union believes that the first two requisites of World Community—a recognized area of common interests, and the common people's willingness to and incipient sense of world citizenship—have been met,

and that the third requisite, Government, presents the definitive challenge of this generation.

Federal Union would meet that challenge in the American way, would build that world government on the American pattern of a federal union of semi-sovereign nations, a new government of the people, by the people, and for the people within that world community in which we beings of the 20th century, like it or not, do live, and think, and earn our living.

The World Church: News and Notes

Catholicism on the New Order

The *Osservatore Romano*, official Vatican newspaper, recently published an editorial in which it declared that Catholicism must be completely neutral as between political systems. It wrote: "If it be true that the Church does not intend to get involved in disputes regarding the terrestrial desirability, utility, and efficacy of temporal forms which purely political institutions or activities take, it is no less true that the Church does not and cannot intend to cease being a light and a guide of consciences in all those questions of principle in which men or their programs might run the risk of forgetting or denying the eternal foundations of divine law . . .

"Catholicism cannot be confused or compared with any idea, any school, party, institution or system whose fate depends upon earthly events, judgments, or conflicts, and whose moral, social, political, or economic advantage consists in choosing one or the other system which is to arise from them . . . For Catholics, as for all reasonable and upright men, the problem does not consist in establishing what ought to be the attitude of religion or the conduct of the Church in calculating probabilities, but on the contrary, what ought to be the orientation of those who prepare to rule civil society toward religion, toward the Church, the grandiose supernatural and social force of Catholicism."

That is to say that the Church is neutral between conflicting political systems, asking only the one question: What is their attitude toward the Church?

In the same week Cardinal van Roy, primate of Belgium, gave a slightly different emphasis. He declared: "One often hears it said that it matters little what a régime is; that the Church can adapt itself to all régimes. We must distinguish. The Church can adapt itself to different régimes provided that those régimes safeguard liberty and do not violate consciences, allowing the Church full exercise of its powers."

Perhaps the difference between the two statements is only very slight, since the Cardinal seems to identify "liberty" with the liberty of the Church.

German Soldiers Support Bishop

A report from Zurich discloses that an entire regiment of the German army, stationed in Münster where the Bishop, Count von Galen, has been under house arrest since September, marched upon the Nazi headquarters

and demanded that the Bishop be freed. It is also reported that a number of young men have appointed themselves the Bishop's personal bodyguard and recently beat up a Gestapo agent who was spying upon the Bishop's palace. The Bishop of Münster is at the present moment the most outspoken critic of Nazism in the Catholic Church of Germany.

Strasbourg Cathedral Closed

The Strasbourg Cathedral, center of the spiritual life of Alsace-Lorraine, has been closed by the Nazis and has been transformed into a center for Nazi youth activity. A correspondent to the *London Times* writes: "Hitler is not content to defame this shrine with his flag of blood; he has banished worship from it, fearing it as one of the strongholds of the faith he has sworn to destroy. To complete its humiliation, figures of saints that adorned the sanctuary have been replaced by pagan statues and portraits of German leaders. A bust of Hitler has been enthroned on the high altar, exposed, as was formerly the Holy Sacrament, to the adoration of his disciples."

Nazis and South American Churches

German speaking churches in South America are of considerable importance. They are assiduously cultivated by Bishop Haeckel who was appointed by the Nazi government to supervise German speaking churches abroad. The pastors of these churches are given free vacation trips to Germany and are treated with the greatest consideration. Bishop Haeckel has ordered that the church conflict in Germany not be mentioned and Niemoeller is therefore unknown in South America. One German church was recently presented with an organ by the German consul, who accompanied his gift with the request that he be allowed to speak a few words to the congregation. The request, once granted, has become the basis of a regular Sunday morning homily by the consul.

Norwegian Bishops Warn Against Harmless Preaching

The Norwegian Bishops have sent a message to the clergy and lay leaders of their Church in which they speak eloquently of the relevance of the Gospel to the daily social problems of life. They write: "It is obvious that the eternal truth and the Gospel of salvation in

CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th Street, New York, N. Y.

\$1.50 per year

10 cents per copy

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR
Chairman
JOHN C. BENNETT
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM
JOHN A. MACKAY

RHODA E. McCULLOCH
FRANCIS P. MILLER
EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

Christ must be preached. But this preaching should be directed to the regeneration of human life upon earth going from the inmost parts of the heart to include every area of the common life of man. The Eternal Word must throw light upon the present situation of our life and the life of all men. In a sinful world it is inevitable that this must involve the condemnation in the light of the Word of God of certain facts in individual and social life. Harmlessly edifying preaching would be a denial of God who desires to touch conscience precisely at its sorest point . . .

"It is not permissible to draw an arbitrary boundary for the Word of God and to maintain that beyond it lies the free sovereignty of the world . . . Such a separation of the different areas of life cannot be reconciled with the claim of God upon the whole of man and the whole of his community life."

Serbian Church Persecuted

Because of its relation to Serbian patriotism, the Greek Orthodox Church continues to be persecuted by the Nazi overlords. The patriarch and Bishop Velimirovitch have been removed from office. The theological faculty at Belgrade has been closed. The orthodox monasteries in Croatia have also been closed. Many priests are in prison and Bishop Platon has been killed. Strong pressure is being exerted in Croatia to persuade the orthodox faithful to become Roman Catholics. A decree requiring all members of the Orthodox Church to wear identifying arm bands has recently been rescinded.

Correspondence

Sirs:

I am interested in the article by Elton Trueblood entitled "Vocational Christian Pacifism." The first half of the paper represents a courageous and realistic facing

of the problem of modern war. This is, indeed, modern thinking about the questions of persecution, nature of adopting a do-nothing policy; there is also frank recognition that it does make a difference as to which side wins. His insistence that while separating themselves from the war effort, pacifists should not obstruct it, seems to me a sound position to hold.

In the second half of the article, however, Dr. Trueblood forsakes his modern ways and falls back into out-moded concepts. He says: "It is necessary that there should be some who keep alive a different conception of how the world should be ordered. The pacifist who keeps alive this different conception is contributing to the future welfare of his people by providing a balance to the extremes of hatred which arise, and by holding aloft the principles of ultimate peace which otherwise might be forgotten." I hold that this is no more the vocation of a pacifist than it is of any other worker for a new type of society in which war has no place. In fact, I find as much devotion to the principles of ultimate peace in groups not technically pacifists as in pacifist groups. Neither do I find any more hatred in these groups than in the pacifist groups. Many Christian peace workers who are supporting this war are doing so just because they want to get rid of what Dr. Trueblood rightly calls the problem of aggression.

Again Dr. Trueblood says, "Those who separate themselves from the war effort are in a splendid position to try to overcome the growing hatred of the people of the Axis nations. And when the actual fighting is over, those who have followed this way, may be expected to have the easiest entrance into the lives of 'enemy peoples'." Here too Dr. Trueblood is contrasting the ardent militarist with the pacifist, rather than with the ardent Christian who is supporting this war, while still disbelieving in war as an accepted policy for the future. He also speaks of the people of the Axis nations as though they were all of one mind. Are there not many German people, for instance, who are at one with the allies in hoping that Hitlerism will not prevail as the new world order? Furthermore, it is not the German people alone, but people in the occupied countries, who will be in need of help after hostilities cease. Will the pacifists have easier access to them than other Christians who gave active help to their release from tyranny? After this war is over, I believe that the people whose sufferings need to be alleviated will welcome equally with the pacifists any others who come to help. I wonder if Dr. Trueblood would not agree that when this time comes, it will be mainly a question of who can do a good job, with genuine understanding and cooperation.

I should like to see Dr. Trueblood approach the post-war problems with the same courage and realism that he used in analyzing the nature of the present struggle and the relation of pacifists to it.

New Canaan, Conn.

HENRIETTA ROELOFS

The Reverend Franklin D. Loehr, author of the article in this issue, is Executive Secretary of the Chicago Metropolitan Council for Federal Union, and a clergyman standing in both the Presbyterian and Congregational Church.

Public Library
Woodward & Kirby Aves.
Detroit, Mich.